



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,899	09/16/2003	James P. von Wolske	VONW:0001D	4515

26122 7590 02/16/2005

LAW OFFICES OF GARY R. STANFORD
330 W OVERLOOK MOUNTAIN RD
BUDA, TX 78610

EXAMINER

SAWHNEY, HARGOBIND S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2875

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

11

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/663,899

Applicant(s)

WOLSKE, JAMES P. VON

Examiner

Hargobind S Sawhney

Art Unit

2875

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: 1-10 and 19.
Claim(s) objected to: 18.
Claim(s) rejected: 11-17.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Sandra O'Shea
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800

Continuation Sheet:

The Request for Reconsideration, including amended claims, filed on January 28, 2005 in response to the final rejection has been considered but is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance.

As detailed in the final rejection mailed on November 30, 2004, Aube' et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,672,240) discloses a docking light system (Figure 2) meeting the limitations of claims 11 and 12. In addition, Wiggerman (U.S. Patent No. 5,339,225) discloses a docking light system meeting the limitations of Claims 13-17 and 20.

Regarding Claim 11, the claim does not include the limitation "forward looking white navigation lights with 225 degree horizontal spread" for the spread light. Further, the specification does not define the mastlight in definite terms. Further, the specification also states "On boats under 12 meters in length, it is permissible to combine the masthead light and the stern light into a single 360 degree all around' light" (Page 5, lines 20-23). Therefore, a docking light system disclosed by Aube' et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,672,240) meets the limitations recited in claims 11 and 12.

As detailed in the Final Office action, Wiggerman ('225) discloses a docking light system (Figure 1) meeting the limitations of claims 13-15 with following teaching. The docking light system comprising

- a docking light fixture 10 receiving a docking lamp 40; and a navigation light 35 provided on the docking light fixture 10 (Figure 1, column 3, lines 20-22, and 50-52);
- the navigation light 35 being a masthead light – positioned in the bow region of the boat- (Figure 1, column 3, lines 27-34); and
- the navigation light 35 being a stern light – positioned in the stern region of the boat- (Figure 1, column 3, lines 27-34).

Please refer to the last office e action for additional details supporting the claimed of the instant application.